icant: Shigeru ONOYA Attorney's Docket No.: 12732-013001 / US4610

Applicant: Shigeru ONOYA Serial No.: 09/778,761 Filed: February 8, 2001

Page : 19 of 20

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-4, 6-15 and 18-27 are pending, with claims 1-4, 7-10, 12-14 and 24 being independent. Claims 5, 16 and 17 have been cancelled, claims 1-4, 6-15 and 18-23 have been amended and new claims 24-27 have been added. No new matter has been added.

The title has been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

Figs. 4, 6, 8 and 21A-D are objected to because of minor informalities. With respect to this objection, Figs. 4, 6, 8 and 21A-21D have been amended as shown in the attached sheets in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions.

Claims 1-7, 11-13, 15 and 18-20 have been rejected as being anticipated by Cole (U.S. Patent No. 6,469,684). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Cole does not describe or suggest inputting display signals having the same polarity to pixel electrodes in a vertical line and, in a certain fixed time period, irregularly or randomly changing pixels to which display signals having a particular polarity are input, as recited in each of independent claims 1-4, 7, 12 and 13.

All of the independent claims have been amended to recite that display signals having the same polarity are input to pixel electrodes in a vertical line and, in a certain fixed time period, the pixels to which display signals having a particular polarity are input are irregularly or randomly changed. Inputting signals of the same polarity to pixel electrodes in a vertical line may be referred to as a source line inverting driving method, and is illustrated in Figs. 2, 4 and 5. Since a screen image tends to moves horizontally more than vertically, vertical striping due to a driving method emerges more easily than horizontal striping. This problem may be solved using the claimed technique.

Cole does not describe or suggest the importance of the combination of a source line inverting driving method and irregularly changing display signals. Rather, Cole, as illustrated by Cole's Fig. 3, describes a dot inverting driving method in which the drive signals supplied to vertical lines of pixels are not required to have the same polarity. While Cole, in Fig. 2C, illustrates a source line inverting driving method, Cole discusses this technique as background and nowhere describes using this technique in conjunction with Cole's method of varying when

Attorney's Docket No.: 12732-013001 / US4610

Applicant: Shigeru ONOYA Serial No.: 09/778,761 Filed: February 8, 2001

Page : 20 of 20

the polarity of the drive signals applied to different pixels changes. Accordingly, for at least this reason, applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-7, 11-13, 15 and 18-20.

Claims 8 and 21 have been rejected as being anticipated by Kanatani. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Kanatani, like Cole, fails to describe or suggest inputting display signals having the same polarity to pixel electrodes in a vertical line and, in a certain fixed time period, irregularly changing pixels to which display signals having a particular polarity are input, as recited independent claim 8. As noted by the Examiner, Kanatani employs a technique in which pixels in a horizontal line are provided with drive signals having the same polarity. Accordingly, for at least this reason, applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8 and 21.

Claims 9 and 22 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Cole in view of Hasegawa. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Hasegawa does not remedy the failure of Cole to describe or suggest inputting display signals having the same polarity to pixel electrodes in a vertical line and, in a certain fixed time period, irregularly changing pixels to which display signals having a particular polarity are input, as recited in independent claim 9.

Claims 10, 14 and 23 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Kanatani in view of Hasegawa. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Hasegawa does not remedy the failure of Kanatani to describe or suggest inputting display signals having the same polarity to pixel electrodes in a vertical line and, in a certain fixed time period, irregularly or randomly changing pixels to which display signals having a particular polarity are input, as recited in independent claims 10 and 14.